

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

* * *

Andreea Melissa Olteanu,

Case No. 2:23-cv-02006-RFB-DJA

Plaintiff,

Order

V.

Louis Schneider, et al.,

Defendants.

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 Plaintiff is proceeding in this action *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*. On June 20, 2024, the Court ordered Plaintiff to file an amended complaint in compliance with the Court’s prior screening order (ECF No. 7) on or before July 18, 2024. (ECF No. 15). Plaintiff filed a document titled “Amended Complaint” on July 23, 2024.¹ (ECF No. 16).

However, the document that Plaintiff filed as an “Amended Complaint” is not an amended pleading, but seeks an extension of time to file her amended complaint. (*Id.*). The Court thus liberally construes Plaintiff’s filing as a motion for extension of time and grants it. The Court makes no findings one way or the other on the arguments that Plaintiff includes in her motion. But it finds that her *pro se* status constitutes good cause and excusable neglect to extend the deadline and does so on that ground only. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b).*

¹ One of the documents Plaintiff filed is dated July 18, 2024. (ECF No. 16 at 4). But the Court's records show that the documents were both filed and entered on July 23, 2024.

1 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiff shall have until **October 28, 2024** to file
2 an amended complaint in compliance with the Court's prior screening order (ECF No. 7).
3 **Failure to timely comply with this order will result in the recommended dismissal of this**
4 **case.** The Clerk of Court is kindly directed to send Plaintiff a copy of this order.

5
6 DATED: September 27, 2024

7
8 
9
10 DANIEL J. ALBREGTS
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28